

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 240 026

SO 015 397

AUTHOR Yost, Thomas E.
TITLE A Survey to Identify University Student Attitudes toward the Role of Government in Controlling Human Population Growth.
PUB DATE 83
NOTE 74p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Birth Rate; Economic Factors; *Federal Programs; *Federal Regulation; *Government Role; *Overpopulation; *Population Growth; Postsecondary Education; Public Policy; Social Problems; Social Science Research; *Student Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Population Control

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain, measure, and evaluate the attitudes of postsecondary students on domestic population issues in order to determine the extent of support for a national government-controlled population stabilization program. A total of 125 students enrolled in either the American government or general sociology course at the University of Central Florida completed a 24-item attitude questionnaire in which they were asked to indicate extent of agreement on statements concerned with rate of population growth, overpopulation, threat to resources, justifiable roles of the U.S. Government, and potential strategies for obtaining controlled population growth. Findings indicated that there is a perceived population problem and that private and voluntary means to achieve population stability are preferred over government intervention and the use of economic incentives or deterrents.
(Author/LP)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED240026

A SURVEY TO IDENTIFY UNIVERSITY STUDENT ATTITUDES
TOWARD THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN CONTROLLING
HUMAN POPULATION GROWTH

A Research Project
Presented to the
College of Education
University of Central Florida

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

- ☐ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☒ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official NIE
position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Thomas E.
Yost

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Thomas E. Yost
Fall, 1983

Approved by

John A. Armstrong

Date

12/6/83

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to obtain, measure, and evaluate student attitudes on domestic population issues in order to determine the extent of support for a national population stabilization program and the concomitant role of government in controlling population growth. One hundred twenty-five University of Central Florida students participated in the study. The participants were asked to respond to a 24-item attitude questionnaire. It was concluded that there is a perceived population problem and that private and voluntary means to achieve population stability are preferred over that of government intervention and the use of economic incentives/deterrents. The survey was both supportive and non-supportive of portions of earlier surveys on domestic population growth.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

To acknowledge in grateful appreciation the following people for their interest, support, encouragement, and patience in this research effort: Dr. Jack Armstrong, Dr. Philip Pollock, Dr. John Hodgkin, Dr. Robert Lange, Dr. Wentworth Clarke, Dr. Stuart Lilie.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.....	iii
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
I.. INTRODUCTION.....	1
Context of the Problem.....	1
Statement of the Problem.....	2
Questions.....	3
Rationale and Significance of the Study.	3
Assumptions.....	4
Limitations.....	5
Definition of Terms.....	5
.II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	9
III. METHODS, PROCEDURES AND DATA ANALYSIS.....	27
Subjects.....	27
Methods and Procedures.....	28
Data Analysis.....	29
IV. RESULTS.....	31
Interpretation of Findings.....	32
V. DISCUSSION.....	54
Conclusions.....	54
Recommendations.....	58
Implications.....	59
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	62
APPENDIX A: Survey Instrument.....	65

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Human population growth in the United States is a serious problem. (Q1).....	35
2. The government should try to do something to slow down population growth in the United States. (Q2).....	36
3. Our natural resources are being used up too fast because of human population growth. (Q3)....	37
4. Another 100 million people added to our present population would be alright. (Q4).....	38
5. The United States should develop a comprehensive and coordinated national population policy with a goal of eventual population stabilization. (Q5).....	39
6. The United States government should not be involved in matters of human population size and growth, should remain neutral, and let our population freely attain its own level. (Q6)....	40
7. Population control and stability is not a proper political or governmental acitivity, function, or obligation. (Q7).....	41
8. In order to halt, or slow down, our population growth and size, the government should use economic deterrents, such as limiting/reducing public-financed medical care, housing, welfare payments, loans, and other subsidies to families after the first 2 children. (Q8).....	42
9. The government should limit by law the number of children a person can have in order to slow down, or halt, our population growth. (Q9).....	43
10. An economic incentive, such as annual cash payment, should be given to those who limit the number of children necessary to halt our population growth. (Q10).....	44

Table	Page
11. Government should tax those who have more children than necessary to halt our population growth. (Q11).....	45
12. Government should abolish all income tax deductions for children who are born in the future. (Q12).....	46
13. Our population growth someday must stop. (Q13)...	47
14. Unregulated human population growth is beneficial, or good, for the United States. (Q14).....	48
15. Assuming that a population problem exists, population stability can be achieved by voluntary means in our democracy by informing/educating people of the causes and consequences of population growth. (Q15).....	49
16. People should limit the size of their family even though they can afford to properly support a larger number of children. (Q16).....	50
17. The present population of the United States is now about 233 million people. In your opinion, what would be the IDEAL number of people for this country? (Q17).....	51
18. In addition to both parents, what do you think is the IDEAL number of natural children that a family should have? (Q18).....	52
19. Percent and number distribution of all student respondents by political philosophy and views on public issues. (Q19).....	53

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Context of the Problem

Human population growth in the United States has been monitored since the arrival of immigrants and colonists from Europe. In the year 1700, there were approximately 280,000 humans in this country. Now, 282 years later (1982), our population surpassed 232,000,000 people. In terms of human population, the United States is currently the fourth largest country on this planet.

The growth of our human population has created a number of social and political issues. These issues are often perceived as problems rising from the capacity of social and political institutions to provide for human needs and wants from available resources. Contemporary population-induced issues include matters such as scarcity, limited choice, immigration, increasing crime rates, pollution, equality, birth control, abortion, welfare, ecological deterioration and/or destruction, employment, and concern for basic human rights.

Our human population growth tends to exert more pressure on our social institutions and natural resources. Simply stated, more people demand more. Growth and

abundance expectations tend to dominate in our society. When faced with scarcity, inequalities become more apparent. The task of determining who gets what becomes a complex and difficult political issue. Solution of these issues takes the form of additional guidelines, limitations, and rules which are expressed as policy and/or law. Political control over the individual, therefore, tends to increase. Increased government intervention into the affairs of the individual is perhaps most often rationalized on the basis of being in the interest of the common good.

In a liberal democracy, such as the form of government which now exists in the United States, any government measure which is perceived as intervening into traditional basic individual rights, freedom, and liberty will inevitably provoke political controversy. Policy and/or laws which explicitly or implicitly, overtly or covertly, impact upon the exercise of the individual's presumed right to procreate freely in the midst of increasingly intense pressure to stabilize our human population has generated profound intellectual, emotional, and moralistic reaction(s).

Statement of the Problem

The purpose of this survey was to determine and evaluate the attitudes of University of Central Florida students toward the role of government in controlling human

population growth in the United States. The concomitant issues of individual primacy, rights, liberty, freedom, and the role and obligations of the individual in a liberal democracy are implicit in this problem.

Questions

1. What percentage of students perceive human population growth in the United States as a serious problem?
2. What percentage of students support a role for government in developing a national population policy with a goal of population stabilization?
3. What percentage of students support findings of earlier surveys on selected domestic human population issues?

Rationale and Significance of the Study

The potential for increased social and economic dysfunction becomes more apparent as our growing human population intensifies pressure upon those social institutions and ecological systems which sustain us. Many leading exponents of human population policy (for example, Brown, McGrath, and Stokes 1976; Day and Day, 1964), argue the need for more rules and regulations, for the common good, to supervise individual behavior in matters of procreation and resource use. In legislating temperance, Ophuls (1977, p. 155) observes: "That we must give our

political authorities great powers to regulate many of our daily actions is a profoundly distasteful thought."

Today, much government activity is aimed at coping with social problems. Some of these problems are population-induced, having their origin in the most intimate of human relations. The procreation of children, birth control, and abortion have political implications in our society. Political reconciliation is exacerbated by expectations of growth and abundance, democratic beliefs and ideals, and by deeply held individual and religious values and attitudes.

From a political perspective, this survey of attitudes may well have a significant bearing on adoption of future population control programs and policies.

From a research perspective, the findings of this survey may indicate the desirability, or need, for additional inquiry.

Assumptions

1. All survey respondents could read and understand the questionnaire items.
2. The survey instrument used in this study will accurately measure student attitudes relevant to human population growth, size and policy.
3. Participants' responses to questionnaire items are responsible and honest.

4. The number of respondents to the survey questionnaire items is sufficient to insure an accurate representation of the total student population of the University of Central Florida.

Limitations

1. The findings and conclusions of this study are restricted in their application to a limited sample of University of Central Florida students.

2. The validity of this survey is dependent upon the quality of the questionnaire items, the adequate return of the questionnaires by respondents, and the conscientiousness of the respondents.

3. This survey does not represent an exhaustive review of the extant literature on demography, population policy, and political philosophy.

Definition of Terms

Attitude--the opinion, viewpoint, and/or disposition which an individual has about an issue, policy, or problem.

Democracy or democratic government--representative government based on the authority of the people, who are able to hold their government responsible through free elections; regards the state as the citizens acting collectively for purposes of government. It

always guarantees extensive civil rights to its citizens and uses the authority of government to enforce these rights. It holds that the individual should have all the personal liberty that is consistent with a well ordered society. It always insists that government be responsible to the people and that the voters have the means to hold government responsible through free elections (Johnson, 1971, p.. 38)..

Democratic values--belief in the fundamental dignity and importance of the individual, essential equality of human beings, and in the individual's need for freedom. Emphasis, however, is on the supreme worth of the individual (Burns & Peltason, 1966, p. 8).

Family planning--conscious, or deliberate, effort of couples to regulate the number and spacing of offspring.

Freedom--absence of coercion or constraints.

Government--institutions and their personnel which make and administer the laws and manage such public affairs as are entrusted to their care (Johnson, 1971, p. 9).

Human or natural rights--those rights which rest on a moral basis; rights not conferred by law. These rights are morally fundamental entitlements not due

to social, institutional, or legal status or rules, and are general and inalienable.

Liberty--self-determination, self-mastery, or control over one's own fate; the absence of constraints imposed by others (Bowie & Simon, 1977, p. 159).

Policy or public policy--what government chooses to do or not to do; government action and/or government inaction (Dye, 1981, pp. 1-3).

Population increase--total population increase resulting from the interaction of births, deaths, and migration in a population in a given period of time (Population Reference Bureau, 1978, p. 57).

Population optimum--ideal number of people that can be sustained in a given area, in contrast to overpopulation and underpopulation (Population Reference Bureau, 1978, p. 57).

Population policy--explicit or implicit, overt or covert, measures instituted by government which are specifically designed to influence a country's human population size, growth, distribution, or composition.

Population stability--unchanging rate of growth and age composition of a human population.

Stationary population--stable population with both a zero growth rate (because the birth rate equals the death rate) and an unchanging age composition (Population Reference Bureau, 1978, p. 59).

Scarcity--relative and/or absolute limitations of natural resources or commodities needed and/or desired by humans. Abundance and availability of resources and commodities is measured in terms of cost and price.

Social institutions--a complex of values, statuses, roles, and norms organized around some functions considered important to society. Modern societies have at least nine social institutions: (1) the family, (2) religion, (3) education, (4) economy, (5) political, (6) science, (7) recreation, (8) art or aesthetics, and (9) military (Wright & Weiss, 1980, pp. 36-37).

Zero population growth--a population in equilibrium, with a growth rate of zero, achieved when births plus immigration equal deaths plus emigration (Population Reference Bureau, 1978, p. 59).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Human population growth is an issue that has persisted over time. The majority of the extant literature reviewed portrays human population growth as a problem to be solved. When viewed from an historical context, the issue represents nothing new. But, due to the ability of this issue to evade resolution over the course of time, the rapid population growth in this country has spurred a renewed and vigorous discussion and debate which is focused upon the role of government.

With few exceptions, this search of literature has as its locus mid-twentieth century domestic population matters and events which culminate in H.R. 907, a bill which is currently before the House of Representatives. If passed, H.R. 907 would establish a national population policy and authorize an Office of Population Policy (U.S., 97th Cong., 1981).

In the first edition of his classic book, An Essay on the Principle of Population, Thomas R. Malthus (1798) persuasively stated his theory on population growth. Malthus' polemical theory on population has served as a benchmark for reference and debate through decades unto

this present time. The major thesis set forth by Malthus is that human population tends to constantly exert pressure on the means of its subsistence, i.e., the supply of food, and tends to increase at a faster rate than its means of subsistence.

Malthus (1798) argued that "checks" to population growth exist. He labeled these checks as "positive" and "preventive." In describing positive checks to population, he writes: "The positive check to population, by which I mean the check that represses an increase which is already begun, is confined chiefly, though not perhaps solely, to the lowest orders of society" (Malthus, 1798). He further observes:

The vices of mankind are active and able ministers of depopulation. They are the precursors in the great army of destruction, and often finish the dreadful work themselves. But should they fail in this war of extermination, sickly seasons, epidemics, pestilence, and plague, advance in terrific array and sweep off their thousands and ten thousands. Should success be still incomplete, gigantic inevitable famine stalks in the rear, and with one mighty blow, levels the population with the food of the world.

Must it not then be acknowledged by an attentive examiner of the histories of mankind, that in every age and in every State in which man has existed, or does not exist,

That the increase of population is necessarily limited by the means of subsistence (Malthus, 1798).

On preventive checks, he writes:

The preventive check appears to operate in some degree through all the ranks of society in England. There are some men, even in the highest rank, who are prevented from marrying by the idea of the expenses that they must retrench, and the fancied pleasures that they must deprive themselves of, on the supposition of having a family. These considerations are certainly trivial, but a preventive foresight of this kind has objects of much greater weight for its contemplation as we go lower (Malthus, 1798).

Malthus (1798) placed these checks under the headings of vice and misery. Vice included "vicious customs with respect to women, great cities, unwholesome manufactures, luxury and war." He provides an example of vice as it relates to misery by observing that "it must be acknowledged I think, that the commission of war is vice, and the effect of it misery, and none can doubt the misery of want of food" (Malthus, 1798).

In a later edition of his Essay, Malthus (1803) added the check of "moral restraint" to those of vice and misery. Moral restraint meant delayed marriage. He describes moral restraint thusly:

It is clearly the duty of each individual not to marry till he has a prospect of supporting his children; but it is at the same time to be wished that he should retain undiminished his desire of marriage, in order that he may exert himself to realize this prospect, and be stimulated to make provision for the support of greater numbers (Malthus, 1803).

Wells (1982, p. 1) argues that Malthus' work "has commonly been misunderstood, misinterpreted or trivialized." Political, social, and economic aspects of Malthus' writing "has largely been ignored" (Wells, 1982, p. 1). Malthus' (1798) Essay also provided a critical commentary on the social conditions of the time, with particular disdain for the "poor-laws" of England having "not succeeded in their intention." The writing of Malthus also concerns itself with freedom, liberty, and a concern for the poor. Government, through its policies, is a factor in human population growth and checks.

Malthus (1798) noted that population growth occurred rapidly in new colonies where food and land was plentiful. Political and economic management of the colonies by the various mother-countries was a vital factor affecting the rate of growth. In contrasting the population growth and prosperity of the English North American colonies to those of Spain and Portugal, Malthus (1798) found that "the powerful People of the United States of America, made by far the most rapid progress. To the plenty of good land which they possessed in common with the Spanish and Portuguese settlements, they added a greater degree of liberty and equality." Malthus (1798) goes on to observe: "The consequence of these favourable circumstances united was a rapidity of increase, probably without parallel in history."

The population and area of the United States has increased considerably since the first census in 1790. In 1790, our population of 3,929,214 persons lived on 864,746 square miles of land, with an average of 4.5 persons per square mile of land (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1982-83, Table 1). Territorial expansion of the conterminous United States was completed with the Gadsden Purchase in 1853 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1982-83, Table 339). In 1980, our population of 226,545,805 persons lived on 3,539,289 square miles of land, with an average of 64.0 persons per square mile of land (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the United States: 1982-83, Table 1). In 1981, the U.S. population increased by over 2.3 million people, which was the highest numerical increase of any developed country (Population Bulletin, 1982, p. 3). The current U.S. population growth rate of about 1.0 percent is one of the highest of the developed nations (Population Bulletin, 1982, p. 3).

In addition to liberty, equality, and the political and economic factors identified by Malthus (1798), McNall (1975, p. 257) succinctly describes additional elements affecting the rapid population growth in the United States:

First, land was plentiful and for a time it was almost free. People were encouraged to immigrate because they could have the opportunity to become landholders. The economic independence derived from obtaining free land encouraged early marriage and large families, because children were regarded as an asset on the frontier. They were needed to help with the chores and to maintain the homestead. The health of the early American settler was good, his isolation keeping epidemics from developing and spreading. With food plentiful and natural resources abundant, famine has never been a problem in the United States. The religion of the early frontier settler was Protestant and the early Protestant churches encouraged large families.

As population grew, government itself grew in size and scope in order to meet the growing demands and expectations of its citizens. According to Johnson (1971, p. 78) the traditional functions of government,

include such things as maintaining order, defining and punishing crimes, and the settling of disputes among their citizens or subjects. They almost always maintain a military force to defend their realms against attack and to suppress revolts and rebellions. They issue money and prescribe standards of weights and measures. They raise funds by taxation and other means to meet their operating expenses.

These traditional functions of government are incorporated into the Constitution of the United States, which provides for the structure of our democratic government. However, our government's activities and functions go beyond the above traditional functions. In order to understand government activities which relate to population growth,

it is necessary to note the bases of this activity. For as Burns and Peltason (1966, p. 660) note: "For at least 160 years we have had a 'welfare state,' to some degree."

The welfare state philosophy is a concept which is prevalent today. This concept has it that government should do those things which provide for the general welfare of its citizens. In the case of the United States, this is embodied in the preamble to our Constitution:

We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

Johnson (1971, p. 82) notes: "To some extent, governments have always engaged in some social welfare activities, such as poor relief." Dye (1981, p. 116) gives an excellent overview of early welfare policy:

Public welfare has been a recognized responsibility of governments in English-speaking nations for almost 400 years. Prior to the 1930s, care of the poor in the United States resembled the early patterns of poor relief established as far back as the Poor Relief Act of 1601 by the English Parliament. Early 'Elizabethan' welfare policy was a combination of punitive as well as alleviative strategies that discouraged all but the most desperately poor from seeking aid, and provided only minimal assistance to those persons clearly unable to care for themselves.

This form of public welfare assistance was primarily economic and was funded from general tax funds in this country. However, in the interest of developing our young Nation, other forms of welfare benefits began to emerge from Federal activity during our early history. Federal land grants of public land, aid to business and farmers, subsidies to help develop our transportation systems and waterways, and tariff protection, were the primary areas of government involvement.

The Great Depression of the 1930s is seen by many (for example, Dye, 1981, pp. 117-122; Burns & Peltason, 1966, pp. 661-666) as the wellspring of expansive Federal social welfare activities. In describing this increased Federal social welfare activity, the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972, p. 19) notes the significance of, and rationale for, government involvement with population policy matters thusly:

The government's role was extended to include not only assistance to help someone in achieving his own welfare, but, where his need is not attributable to his own responsibility but to social factors beyond his control, responsibility for providing the welfare itself. Moreover, the number of goods and services counted as welfare was greatly expanded (e.g., to interest groups: national opera companies, farm subsidies, urban renewal, oil depletion allowances; to individuals: Medicare, subsidized housing, recreational and rehabilitation retraining, Veterans Administration, Federal Housing Administration, mortgage guarantees).

The importance of these developments for population limitation are plain. If it is the government's duty to assure that each individual has a decent minimum income, reasonable adequate housing, relatively pure water to drink, clean air to breathe, enough space for exercise, then government must ultimately have the means to accomplish these ends. If the only means to those ends involves some restriction on bringing new people into the world, then so be it. A comparable development is the considerable restrictions and cutting away at the matrix of 'property rights,' when it became apparent to the great majority that the duties demanded of government could not otherwise be discharged.

Although government activity in controlling human population growth is firmly rooted in the welfare state concept, a variety of other grounds, such as the provision of public goods, paternalistic concerns, and other externalities, are cited as justification for government intervention (Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972, pp. 155-164). It is important to note that the Commission did acknowledge the difficulty of defining and analyzing such general terms and concepts as "welfare," "general welfare," "the common good," and "the public interest" (1972, pp. 12-14).

Barnett (1971) seen the years 1969 and 1970 as being particularly significant in the emergence of domestic population growth and environmental deterioration as salient public issues in the United States. He observes:

First, for several years a substantial proportion of Americans apparently had not possessed attitudes favorable to continued

domestic population increase. Second, the existence of a number of outspoken public figures and scientists advocating population control as a necessary condition for avoiding ecological disaster both permitted and precipitated the coalescence of these individual, private attitudes into a public concern with population growth (Barnett, 1971, p. 759).

One such advocate of population control, Spengler (1969) echoed the concerns and fears of Malthus (1798). Spengler (1969, pp. 1234-1238) urged that preventive measures be taken to halt population growth before the "positive repressants will halt population growth in a pressure-ridden world;" suggested that individual incentive and conscience had failed to control the growing number of births; establish a target population size and the socio-economic mechanisms to achieve it; and implied that the "so-called right to parenthood" may have to be "transformed into a privilege to be earned before it may be exercised."

President Nixon established a National Goals Research Staff in the White House in 1969. This Staff was to prepare an annual report which set forth some of the key policy choices, along with the consequences of those choices, facing the United States. The first report of the National Goals Research Staff, in July 1970, was entitled "Toward Balanced Growth; Quantity with Quality." The portion on population made some bold statements:

A considerable number of population experts strongly endorse the goal of a zero rate of increase--that is, a stationary population--as soon as we can achieve it. This means that in the interest of society, all American families should have an average of two children. Even many of those who do not see the problem as pressing see this as a desirable goal.

This choice implies a significant change in public policy. It calls for a deliberate government effort to promote the reduction in the growth rate until population stability is achieved. It also implies that we must not leave the possibility of population stability to chance. It means we may have to do more than rely upon liberalized abortion laws in the States, and upon the distribution of free contraceptives to the poor, who are the focus of most U.S. family-planning programs. We may also have to devise ways of changing individual and social attitudes, governmental policies and incentives, and through these, the motivation of young people and adults in all socioeconomic groups.

Even if the country elects the goal of arresting the growth of U.S. population by the end of the century, it is not at all clear whether or not the Government can bring about a societal consensus voluntarily to control the growth of the U.S. population within a generation. More active public policies might be required than 'moral encouragement.' Changes in tax laws and health insurance programs might help. An extreme form of an active public policy would be to regulate family size by fiat. Some persons have even gone so far as to suggest enforced sterilization when each family reaches its maximum allowance. Less drastic forms of coercion could be devised. But whatever the form, coercion in the regulation of family size is likely to be unacceptable to the American people (The Global 2000 Report to the President of the U.S., 1980, p. 334).

The first presidential message on population was issued in 1969 by President Richard Nixon. In his message to

Congress, Nixon discussed domestic and world population growth, the need for more research on birth control methods, and saw a need for the establishment of family planning services as a national goal (The Global 2000 Report to the President of the U.S., 1980, p. 336). Nixon requested the Congress to establish a commission to further study domestic population growth.

In 1970, Congress passed a bill, signed by President Nixon, which created a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. The Commission's task and mission was to "provide information and education to all levels of government in the United States, and to our people, regarding a broad range of problems associated with population growth and their implications for America's future" (The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972, p. 583).

John D. Rockefeller III, who chaired the Commission, summarized the findings and recommendations in a letter of transmittal which stated:

We have concluded that, in the long run, no substantial benefits will result from further growth of the Nation's population, rather that the gradual stabilization of our population through voluntary means would contribute significantly to the Nation's ability to solve its problems. We have looked for, and have not found, any convincing economic arguments for continued population growth. The health of our country does not depend on it, nor does the vitality of business nor the welfare of the average person (Matras, 1977, p. 363).

The Commission made over 60 recommendations. Many of the more than 60 recommendations were overshadowed by publicity given to those concerning contraceptive information and services to minors, and to government support and/or funding of abortion. Some of the Commission's recommendations suggested a permanent role for government in controlling human population growth by recommending:

Creation of an Office of Population Growth and Distribution within the Executive Office of the President;

Establishment, within the National Institutes of Health, of a National Institute of Population Sciences to provide an adequate institutional framework for implementing a greatly expanded program of population research;

Legislation by Congress establishing a Council of Social Advisors, with one of the main functions the monitoring of demographic variables;

The addition of a mid-decade census of the population; and

National planning for a stabilized population (The Global 2000 Report to the President of the U.S., 1980, p. 337).

In 1970, Congress passed the Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970, which is also known as the Tydings Bill. This Bill has as its central purpose the promotion of "public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning service and population research activities of the Federal Government" (Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972, p. 583).

There were a number of legislative proposals dealing with Federal intervention in matters of population growth and policy introduced in Congress subsequent to passage of the Tydings Bill. However, H.R. 907 appears to be the most significant in terms of justifying Federal responsibility for population stabilization.

H.R. 907, the National Population Policy Bill, was introduced by Representative Richard J. Ottinger of New York on January 19, 1981. The Bill has 20 House co-sponsors and the support of many public interest, population, and environmental groups and organizations. A summary digest of H.R. 907 states in part:

Declares that the Federal Government is responsible for coordinated planning for population change and that eventual population stabilization is a national goal. States the intent of Congress to include in U.S. foreign policy the goals of encouraging global population stabilization and of attaining a long-term balance among population, resources and the environment (Congressional Research Service, 1983).

Congressional hearings serve as a forum for debate on the merits of proposed legislation. Most of those participating in the hearings on H.R. 907 are recognized leaders, or experts, on population matters and many had experience in public policy formulation at various levels of government, professional, and civic institutions.

A review of the hearings on H.R. 907 reveals that a

significant number of individuals and organized groups favoring action to achieve population stability dominated the hearings. During hearings before the House subcommittee on Census and Population, Chairman Robert Garcia cautioned that,

Population stabilization, limiting the size of our families, or even exploring the possibility, is a very frightening prospect to many Americans. The thought of a population policy has overtones of Big Brother (U.S. 97th Cong., 2d sess., 1982, p. 1).

Oral testimony by Ben J. Wattenberg, Senior Fellow, American Enterprise Institute, echoed this cautionary observation by stating:

So what we are talking about is the U.S. Government attempting to influence its people about how many babies they ought to have. This is worth talking about. The phrase was used, I think by Senator Hatfield earlier today, that we ought to have a 'grand design.' I must tell you that when governments start coming up with grand designs, about how many children people ought to have, I get very, very nervous (U.S. Cong., 2d sess., 1982, p. 197).

Poll and survey information was used during hearings on H.R. 907. Representative Richard Ottinger, the Bill's sponsor, cited a 1976 Gallup poll which found 87 percent of those polled favor an end to our population growth (U.S., Congress, Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, Hearings before a subcommittee on Census and Population on the Global 2000 Report, 97th Cong., 1st sess.,

1981, p. 3). During a later hearing on H.R. 907, before the same subcommittee, Carole L. Baker, the Executive Director of Zero Population Growth, testified that,

As early as 1967, a Gallup poll told us that 54 percent of those Americans responding said U.S. population growth is a serious problem. In 1971, a poll that was conducted for the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, showed that 65 percent of the respondents felt that the Federal Government should attempt to slow population growth in this country. In 1977, another Gallup poll showed 57 percent of the respondents did not wish that the U.S. had more people; and in 1979, a Roper poll resulted in more than half of the respondents saying that the U.S. cannot reasonably support more people (U.S. Cong., 2d sess., 1982, p. 200).

In a 1970 poll of Zero Population Growth, Inc, members, Barnett (1971, pp. 759-765) found,

the majority of those cognizant of the necessity of the one-child family intended to have two natural children, even when they felt the United States was already greatly overpopulated. Particularly in view of the fact that this finding is from the members of a population control organization, it further supports the proposition that there is no intrinsic link between concern with population growth as a general problem and the personal commitment to limit the number of one's natural children to what is necessary for population stabilization in one's own lifetime.

Barnett also found the population control policy,

with the most support--gaining the approval of roughly four out of five respondents--was a system of tax penalties for excessive childbearing.

On the other hand, the least support was given to governmental limitation on number of children--an approach endorsed by one out of three (1971, pp. 759-765).

In 1971, the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future conducted a nationwide survey on a number of population issues. Between 86 percent and 97 percent thought that population growth was a problem; 64 percent agreed that population growth is producing a lot of social unrest and dissatisfaction; more than half favored government action to slow down population growth in the United States; 68 percent were opposed to any policy using the income tax to encourage or discourage childbearing; more than half agreed that people should limit the size of their families even if they can afford more children; and 57 percent thought the present population, i.e., 1970 population, was about right. The Commission felt that the nationwide survey results indicated "potential support for a national stabilization program" (Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972, pp. 475-509).

The debate on population control has many legal and constitutional aspects.¹ While it is not within the scope

¹For a comprehensive discussion and constitutional analysis of population control proposals in terms of values and activities protected by the Supreme Court, see, e.g., "Legal Analysis and Population Control: The Problem of Coercion," *Harvard Law Review*, 84 (1971): 1856-1911. For a discussion on reproductive freedom and a brief summary of major court decisions affecting reproductive rights, see, Janet Benshoof, "Reproductive Freedom," ed. Kenneth P. Norwick (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1983), pp. 71-111; 242-246.

of this review to discuss the various constitutional aspects of population control programs to depress the size of families, two cases upholding the government's right to interfere with the body of an individual on the grounds that such interference promotes the general welfare, were noted by the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future:

Jacobson v. Massachusetts (1905) upheld the State of Massachusetts to require compulsory vaccination against smallpox. The Court held that the state has the right to promote the general welfare, at least in such matters as health, despite an individual's claim that the sanctity of this body was being violated. In Buck v. Bell (1927), the court upheld a Virginia law permitting the state to sterilize individuals with a hereditary form of insanity or imbecility (1972, p. 19).

In summary, the review of literature served to examine the theoretical writings of Thomas R. Malthus, some factors which encouraged rapid population growth in the United States, increased Federal activity based upon the welfare state concept, and poll and survey data, which serve as the bases for increased Government intervention and activity in controlling human population growth. The literature review also served to provide the basis for the development of the opinion survey questionnaire used in this study.

CHAPTER III
METHODS, PROCEDURES AND DATA ANALYSIS

The study was conducted at the University of Central Florida located in Orlando, Florida. The University serves a student population of approximately 14,000. A variety of academic programs are offered to serve a variety of student interests and needs. The Orlando Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area (SMSA) has a population of 700,055 which consists of 253,000 households with 2.7 persons per household (U.S. Bureau of the Census, Statistical Abstract of the U.S.: 1982-83).

Subjects

One hundred twenty-five subjects participated in this study. There was no experimental or control group. Students participating in the survey represented a diverse number of socioeconomic, religious, political, and age groups. Students participating in the survey were enrolled in either the American Government or the General Sociology courses. These classes were selected in order to obtain a random cross-section representation of the student population. Student participation in the survey was voluntary.

Methods and Procedures

The instrument used in this study was a twenty-four statement questionnaire. The questionnaire statements were structured in a manner similar to those used in earlier surveys by Barnett (1971) and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972). The survey items were specifically designed to obtain and measure current student attitudes on domestic population issues in order to determine the extent of support for a national population stabilization program.

The Likert-type attitude scale provides all respondents with a five-point rating scale with which to register their opinions for 16 of the 24 survey items. Respondents indicated the extent of agreement or disagreement by placing a number before each statement. The five categories were: (1) Completely agree, (2) Generally agree, (3) Not sure; undecided, (4) Generally disagree, and (5) Completely disagree. Two open-ended statements permitted the respondent to indicate the ideal population for this country and the ideal number of natural children that a family should have. The remaining six survey items solicited general information about the respondent.

Cognizant course instructors were personally contacted by the researcher. The purpose of the survey was explained, and permission obtained to conduct the survey during

scheduled class times. The survey questionnaire was distributed to all students wishing to participate by the researcher. This methodology enhanced a high completion and return rate. Respondents received no special training or instruction other than a statement by the researcher stating the purpose of the survey. The researcher personally collected the completed survey questionnaires.

Data Analysis

The design methodology used in this research is exploratory/descriptive (Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 1979). The questionnaire serves as the vehicle to explore, or seek, points of view and attitudes held by students, and then to interpret and describe these views and attitudes. All survey items were configured to permit central tendencies to be measured through the use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (BSPSS*SPSS8) computer program.

Survey items 1 through 18 (Q1 through Q18) were cross-tabulated with six independent variables (Q19 through Q24). The data analysis were concerned with determining the distribution of the student sample on each of the 18 dependent variables relevant to major population issues. The cross-tabulation with independent variables enabled the researcher to ascertain whether relationships exist among the respondents between variables on the population

issues. This approach also enables the researcher to make comparisons with earlier survey results reported by Barnett (1971) and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972). The results of the data analysis are expressed as percent responses to each item and displayed in tabular format in Chapter IV.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to determine and evaluate the attitudes of University of Central Florida students toward the role of government in controlling human population growth in the United States. This sample survey was not designed to test hypotheses, but, rather to seek information on current student attitudes toward possible national population policies and personal dispositions relevant to population growth. Ary, Jacobs, and Razavieh (1979) note that surveys, such as this, measure psychological or sociological constructs, and are not necessarily restricted to simple tabulation(s) of tangible objects.

Selection of the Likert-type scale, as the instrument for the measurement of the constructs involved in this sample survey, enabled the researcher to measure the degree to which the respondent possessed the characteristic of interest. The data were analyzed in terms of whether 50 percent or more of the respondents agreed or disagreed with the survey item. Disagreement with an unfavorable statement is assumed to be the psychological equivalent to

agreement with a favorable statement (Ary, Jacobs & Razavieh, 1979).

Interpretation of Findings

The demographic and other socioeconomic characteristics of student respondents in the sample population are as follows:

1. Nonwhites were sparsely represented in the population sample. Eight blacks and seven other respondents, out of a total of 125 participants, represented 12 percent of the sample population.

2. Females outnumbered males 57.6 percent to 42.4 percent.

3. Fifty-five percent of the respondents were under the age of 20. The age distribution of students participating in this study shows the respondents belonging to the younger age categories (see Tables 1 through 18).

4. In responding to the open-end question on religious faith, 50.4 percent of the student respondents stated Protestant affiliations,¹ 28 percent stated Catholic, 15.2 percent stated None or No Answer, 4 percent stated Other/Agnostic, and 2.4 percent stated Jewish.

¹Protestant religious affiliation classification was determined by including the following responses to the open-ended question: "What is your religion, if any?" (Q21) - Presbyterian, Lutheran, Baptist, Methodist, Episcopalian, and Christian.

5. A fixed-alternative question sought to determine general political affiliation distribution of the respondents. Thirty-two percent of the students felt they were Republican, 28 percent were Democrat, 24.8 percent were Independent, 13.6 percent stated None or Other, and 1.6 percent did not answer.

The major findings of this survey indicate that student respondents are inclined to agree that human population growth is a serious problem. Tables 1 and 3 display this perception.

There is an inclination to agree that the present population of about 233 million people is about right (see Tables 4 and 17).

Government intervention in matters of population growth and population policy development does not appear to be accepted by the student respondents (see Tables 2, 5, and 7). The matter of government intervention suggested that deep division(s) exist among the respondents on this issue. Inexplicably, Tables 5 and 6, and 7 and 14, tend to exemplify a dichotomy in that government intervention appears to be simultaneously suggested and rejected. This dichotomy may be explained, in part, by the absence of specific government intervention alternatives and/or specific policy proposals. For example, Table 5 displays an equal agree-disagree response among all respondents

(36 percent) to the statement regarding the development of a national population policy with a goal of eventual population stabilization. The statement is broad and does not address the specifics of such a policy or how population stabilization is to be achieved. However, when specific means were suggested to achieve population stabilization, student responses tended to be more meaningful and useful (see Tables 8, 10, 11, and 12).

.. Statutory approaches by the government to regulate population growth were soundly rejected (see Table 9).

There was an overwhelming student consensus (82.4 percent) that population stability can be achieved by voluntary means. This view tends to be supported by student opinions indicating a preference for self-limitation on family size, even though a larger number of children could be properly supported, and by suggesting the 2-child family as being the ideal number of natural children that a family should have (see Tables 15, 16, and 18).

The specific findings of this survey are displayed in tabular format (Tables 1 through 19) on the following pages.

Table 1

Human population growth in the United States
is a serious problem. (Q1)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	18.4	38.4	16.8	22.4	4.0	125
Male.....	20.8	32.1	13.2	24.5	9.4	53
Female.....	16.7	43.1	19.4	20.8	0.0	72
Black.....	50.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	8
White.....	17.3	40.0	17.3	21.8	3.6	110
Other.....	0.0	28.6	14.3	42.9	14.3	7
Catholic.....	5.7	42.9	17.1	31.4	2.9	35
Protestant....	23.8	36.5	19.0	19.0	1.6	63
Jewish.....	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	5
None/No Answer	21.1	42.1	5.3	26.3	5.3	19
Under 20.....	15.9	44.9	15.9	21.7	1.4	69
21-25.....	20.0	33.3	23.3	20.0	3.3	30
26-30.....	15.4	38.5	7.7	23.1	15.4	13
31-35.....	25.0	12.5	25.0	37.5	0.0	8
36-40.....	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Over half the student respondents (56.8 percent) felt that population growth is a serious problem. Females (59.8 percent), blacks (75 percent), Jews (66.6 percent), and those over 40 years of age were more inclined to agree with this statement. Respondents in the "Other" race category seemingly contradict their white and black counterparts. Those in the "Other" race category, albeit a relatively small number, did not agree (57.2 percent) that population growth is a serious problem.

Table 2

The government should try to do something to slow down population growth in the United States: (Q2)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	6.4	25.6	27.2	23.2	17.6	125
Male.....	11.3	26.4	17.0	22.6	22.6	53
Female.....	2.8	25.0	34.7	23.6	13.9	72
Black.....	12.5	12.5	25.0	25.0	25.0	8
White.....	6.4	26.4	26.4	23.6	23.6	110
Other.....	0.0	28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3	7
Catholic.....	2.9	22.9	20.0	25.7	38.6	35
Protestant....	4.8	28.6	33.3	20.6	12.7	63
Jewish.....	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	40.0	5
None/No Answer	15.8	21.1	26.3	26.3	10.5	19
Under 20.....	4.3	27.5	26.1	24.6	17.4	69
21-25.....	13.3	26.7	33.3	16.7	10.0	30
26-30.....	0.0	23.1	15.4	38.5	23.1	13
31-35.....	12.5	12.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
Democrat.....	5.7	40.0	22.9	20.0	11.4	35
Republican....	0.0	27.5	22.5	25.0	25.0	40
Independent...	12.9	19.4	35.5	16.1	16.1	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	5.9	5.9	35.3	35.3	17.6	17
No Answer.....	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Less than half the student respondents (32 percent) favored government action to slow population growth in the United States. Slightly over 40 percent of the student respondents did not favor government action. There was a tendency for Catholics to look more unfavorably (64.3 percent) upon government action to a greater extent than Protestants (53.9 percent). Male respondents were more likely to disagree (45.2 percent) than females (37.5 percent). No major grouping supported government action to slow population growth.

Table 3

Our natural resources are being used up too fast because
of human population growth. (Q3)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	18.4	36.8	17.6	24.0	3.2	125
Male.....	18.9	37.7	17.0	22.6	3.8	53
Female.....	18.1	36.1	18.1	25.0	2.8	72
Black.....	0.0	62.5	25.0	12.5	0.0	8
White.....	20.9	35.5	17.3	22.7	3.6	110
Other.....	0.0	28.6	14.3	57.1	0.0	7
Catholic.....	8.6	42.9	22.9	22.9	2.9	35
Protestant....	20.6	39.7	15.9	19.0	4.8	63
Jewish.....	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	5
None/No Answer	21.1	31.6	15.8	31.6	0.0	19
Under 20.....	17.4	34.8	20.3	24.6	2.9	69
21-25.....	20.0	50.0	20.0	10.0	0.0	30
26-30.....	23.1	23.1	7.7	30.8	15.4	13
31-35.....	12.5	12.5	12.5	62.5	0.0	8
36-40.....	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	33.3	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

More than half the respondents (55.2 percent) agreed that our natural resources are being used up too fast because of population growth. Males and females, whites and blacks, were more likely to agree with the statement.

The racial distinction is pronounced among those in the "Other" racial classification because more than half (57.1 percent) expressed disagreement with the statement. General agreement with the statement is evident among the three major religious groups. Respondents in the 21-25 age classification strongly agreed (70 percent) with the statement, while all those respondents over the age of 40 unanimously accepted the statement.

Table 4

Another 100 million people added to our present population would be alright. (Q4)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	0.8	10.4	35.2	28.8	24.8	125
Male.....	1.9	11.3	30.2	35.8	20.8	53
Female.....	0.0	9.7	38.9	23.6	27.8	72
Black.....	0.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	62.5	8
White.....	0.9	10.0	36.4	29.1	23.6	110
Other.....	0.0	14.3	57.1	28.6	0.0	7
Catholic.....	0.0	8.6	40.0	40.0	11.4	35
Protestant....	1.6	11.1	31.7	25.4	30.2	63
Jewish.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	3
Agnostic/Other	0.0	0.0	80.0	0.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	0.0	15.8	31.6	26.3	26.3	19
Under 20.....	0.0	11.6	34.8	29.0	24.6	69
21-25.....	0.0	10.0	26.7	36.7	26.7	30
26-30.....	7.7	7.7	61.5	15.4	7.7	13
31-35.....	0.0	12.5	50.0	0.0	37.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	66.7	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

More than half the student respondents (53.6 percent) agreed that another 100 million people added to our present population is not alright. No major group supported an increase in population (100 million) above the present size. Disagreement with the statement was greatest among males, blacks, Protestants, and those below the age of 25. Those over the age of 36 also indicated disagreement with the statement.

Table 5

The United States should develop a comprehensive and coordinated national population policy with a goal of eventual population stabilization. (Q5)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	11.2	24.8	28.0	20.8	15.2	125
Male.....	13.2	30.2	22.6	15.1	18.9	53
Female.....	9.7	20.8	31.9	25.0	12.5	72
Black.....	37.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	37.5	8
White.....	10.0	25.5	28.2	22.7	13.6	110
Other.....	0.0	28.6	57.1	0.0	14.3	7
Catholic.....	2.9	20.0	14.3	42.9	20.0	35
Protestant....	12.7	30.2	31.7	11.1	14.3	63
Jewish.....	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	21.1	10.5	42.1	15.8	10.5	19
Under 20.....	10.1	29.0	24.6	20.3	15.9	69
21-25.....	20.0	23.3	26.7	26.7	3.3	30
26-30.....	0.0	15.4	46.2	7.7	30.8	13
31-35.....	12.5	25.0	37.5	25.0	0.0	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	3
Democrat.....	17.1	20.0	28.6	22.9	11.4	35
Republican....	5.0	17.5	37.5	17.5	22.5	40
Independent...	12.9	32.3	22.6	22.6	9.7	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	5.9	35.3	17.6	23.5	17.6	17
No Answer.....	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Student respondents equally agreed and disagreed (36 percent) with the statement that government should develop a population policy designed to stabilize population. Males (43.4 percent), blacks (50 percent), Jews (66.7 percent), and those under the age of 25, were more inclined to support the statement. Greatest non-support for the development of a population policy was found among Catholics (62.9 percent) and those respondents over the age of 36.

Table 6

The United States government should not be involved in matters of human population size and growth, should remain neutral, and let our population freely attain its own level. (Q6)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	12.0	24.0	12.0	35.2	16.8	125
Male.....	17.0	18.9	9.4	32.1	22.6	53
Female.....	8.3	27.8	13.9	37.5	12.5	72
Black.....	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	25.0	8
White.....	11.8	23.6	11.8	36.4	16.4	110
Other.....	0.0	28.6	14.3	42.9	14.3	7
Catholic.....	14.3	40.0	14.3	25.7	5.7	35
Protestant....	9.5	19.0	7.9	42.9	20.6	63
Jewish.....	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	40.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	10.5	15.8	15.8	31.6	26.3	19
Under 20.....	13.0	24.6	11.6	34.8	15.9	69
21-25.....	0.0	26.7	10.0	40.0	23.3	30
26-30.....	23.1	30.8	15.4	23.1	7.7	13
31-35.....	12.5	12.5	25.0	37.5	12.5	8
36-40.....	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	3
Democrat.....	8.6	22.9	2.9	40.0	25.7	35
Republican....	17.5	25.0	17.5	32.5	7.5	40
Independent...	12.9	16.1	12.9	41.9	16.1	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	5.9	35.3	17.6	23.5	17.6	17
No Answer.....	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Over half the student respondents (52 percent) thought that government should not remain neutral in permitting our population to freely attain its own level. Half the females (50 percent) disagreed with the statement. Those who were white, Protestant, and in the 21-25 age category were more likely to disagree that government should maintain neutrality and let population freely attain its own level. Weak agreement with the statement is found only in the 26-30 age group and among Catholics. Blacks tended to agree more strongly.

Table 7

Population control and stability is not a proper political or governmental activity, function, or obligation. (Q7)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	14.4	29.6	18.4	27.2	10.4	125
Male.....	17.0	26.4	17.0	26.4	13.2	53
Female.....	12.5	31.9	19.4	27.8	8.3	72
Black.....	25.0	25.0	25.0	12.5	12.5	8
White.....	13.6	29.1	18.2	28.2	10.9	110
Other.....	14.3	42.9	14.3	28.6	0.0	7
Catholic.....	14.3	40.0	28.6	14.3	2.9	35
Protestant....	9.5	25.4	19.0	31.7	14.3	63
Jewish.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	40.0	40.0	0.0	0.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	21.1	26.3	5.3	36.8	10.5	19
Under 20.....	14.5	31.9	23.2	21.7	8.7	69
21-25.....	6.7	26.7	13.3	36.7	16.7	30
26-30.....	23.1	30.8	7.7	38.5	0.0	13
31-35.....	12.5	25.0	12.5	37.5	12.5	8
36-40.....	50.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	3
Democrat.....	11.4	28.6	17.1	25.7	17.1	35
Republican....	17.5	35.0	17.5	27.5	2.5	40
Independent...	16.1	16.1	22.6	32.3	12.9	31
Other/None/ Don't Know...	5.9	47.1	17.6	23.5	5.9	17
No Answer.....	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Forty-four percent of the student respondents agreed with the statement and 37.6 percent disagreed. Catholics (54.3 percent) were more inclined to agree that population control and stability is not a proper political or governmental activity than were non-Catholics. Democrats and Independents were more inclined to disagree with the statement.

Table 8

In order to halt, or slow down, our population growth and size, the government should use economic deterrents, such as limiting/reducing public-financed medical care, housing, welfare payments, loans, and other subsidies to families after the first 2 children. (Q8)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	10.4	27.2	20.8	22.4	19.2	125
Male.....	13.2	28.3	17.0	20.8	20.8	53
Female.....	8.3	26.4	23.6	23.6	18.1	72
Black.....	12.5	0.0	50.0	0.0	37.5	8
White.....	10.9	29.1	17.3	25.5	17.3	110
Other.....	0.0	28.6	42.9	0.0	28.6	7
Catholic.....	5.7	25.7	25.7	25.7	17.1	35
Protestant....	14.3	20.6	19.0	23.8	22.2	63
Jewish.....	0.0	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	5.3	52.6	10.5	15.8	15.8	19
Under 20.....	7.2	26.1	23.2	27.5	15.9	69
21-25.....	16.7	30.0	23.3	16.7	13.3	30
26-30.....	7.7	46.2	7.7	7.7	30.8	13
31-35.....	25.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	3
Democrat.....	11.4	25.7	31.4	20.0	11.4	35
Republican....	12.5	17.5	17.5	30.0	22.5	40
Independent...	9.7	38.7	9.7	19.4	22.6	31
Other/None/Don't Know..	5.9	29.4	23.5	17.6	23.5	17
No Answer.....	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Thirty-seven percent of the student respondents agreed with the statement and 41.6 percent disagreed. Opposition to the use of economic deterrents to halt, or slow down, population growth is strongest among Protestants, whites, and Republicans.

Table 9

The government should limit by law the number of children a person can have in order to slow down, or halt, our population growth. (Q9)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	2.4	10.4	12.0	20.0	55.2	125
Male.....	1.9	18.9	11.3	17.0	50.9	53
Female.....	2.8	4.2	12.5	22.2	58.3	72
Black.....	12.5	12.5	12.5	25.0	37.5	8
White.....	1.8	10.9	11.8	18.2	57.3	110
Other.....	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	7
Catholic.....	5.7	2.9	8.6	20.0	62.9	35
Protestant....	1.6	9.5	17.5	22.2	49.2	63
Jewish.....	0.0	66.7	0.0	0.0	33.3	3
Agnostic/Other	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	60.0	5
None/No Answer	0.0	15.8	5.3	15.8	63.2	19
Under 20.....	1.4	13.0	11.6	26.1	47.8	69
21-25.....	3.3	10.0	10.0	16.7	60.0	30
26-30.....	0.0	0.0	15.4	7.7	76.9	13
31-35.....	12.5	12.5	12.5	12.5	50.0	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	3
Democrat.....	8.6	5.7	14.3	25.7	45.7	35
Republican....	0.0	5.0	15.0	22.5	57.5	40
Independent...	0.0	19.4	6.5	16.1	58.1	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	0.0	17.6	11.8	11.8	58.8	17
No Answer.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

More than half every group strongly felt that government should not implement law(s) designed to limit the number of children a person can have in order to slow down, or halt, population growth. Two-thirds of the student respondents (75.2 percent) indicated a strong disagreement with the statement.

Table 10

An economic incentive, such as an annual cash payment, should be given to those who limit the number of children necessary to halt our population growth. (Q10)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	5.6	27.2	18.4	21.6	27.2	125
Male.....	5.7	30.2	15.1	17.0	32.1	53
Female.....	5.6	25.0	20.8	25.0	23.6	72
Black.....	12.5	37.5	25.0	12.5	12.5	8
White.....	5.5	27.3	17.3	21.8	28.2	110
Other.....	0.0	14.3	28.6	28.6	28.6	7
Catholic.....	8.6	22.9	20.0	22.9	25.7	35
Protestant....	4.8	34.9	19.0	15.9	25.4	63
Jewish.....	0.0	33.3	0.0	66.7	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	60.0	5
None/No Answer	5.3	10.5	15.8	36.8	31.6	19
Under 20.....	2.9	33.3	17.4	24.6	21.7	69
21-25.....	6.7	23.3	23.3	20.0	26.7	30
26-30.....	0.0	23.1	15.4	30.8	30.8	13
31-35.....	12.5	12.5	25.0	0.0	50.0	8
36-40.....	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
Democrat.....	8.6	28.6	20.0	25.7	17.1	35
Republican....	2.5	22.5	20.0	20.0	35.0	40
Independent...	9.7	32.3	12.9	16.1	29.0	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	0.0	29.4	23.5	23.5	23.5	17
No Answer.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Thirty-two percent of the student respondents agreed with the statement and 48.8 percent disagreed. Half the white students were inclined to disagree with the use of economic incentives, such as cash payments, to halt population growth, while their black counterparts agreed (50 percent) with this approach. Disagreement with the statement was strongest among Catholics (48.6 percent), those in the 26-30 age category (61.6 percent), and Republicans (55 percent).

Table 11

Government should tax those who have more children than necessary to halt our population growth. (Q11)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	8.0	4.8	17.6	28.0	41.6	125
Male.....	13.2	1.9	15.1	26.4	43.4	53
Female.....	4.2	6.9	19.4	29.2	40.3	72
Black.....	12.5	12.5	37.5	0.0	37.5	8
White.....	8.2	4.5	16.4	29.1	41.8	110
Other.....	0.0	0.0	14.3	42.9	42.9	7
Catholic.....	2.9	5.7	20.0	25.7	45.7	35
Protestant....	9.5	6.3	17.5	27.0	39.7	63
Jewish.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	0.0	0.0	40.0	40.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	10.5	0.0	10.5	26.3	52.6	19
Under 20.....	7.2	7.2	23.2	31.9	30.4	69
21-25.....	6.7	3.3	16.7	20.0	53.3	30
26-30.....	7.7	0.0	7.7	15.4	69.2	13
31-35.....	12.5	0.0	0.0	62.5	25.0	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2
Over 40.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
Democrat.....	5.7	5.7	25.7	20.0	42.9	35
Republican....	5.0	0.0	17.5	32.5	45.0	40
Independent...	12.9	9.7	12.9	25.8	38.7	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	11.8	5.9	11.8	35.3	35.3	17
No Answer.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Over 69 percent of the student respondents disagreed with the statement that government should place a tax upon those who have more children than necessary to halt population growth. Strong opposition to the statement is reflected in all major groupings.

Table 12

Government should abolish all income tax deductions for children who are born in the future. (Q12)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	1.6	2.4	11.2	35.2	49.6	125
Male.....	1.9	3.8	15.1	37.7	41.5	53
Female.....	1.4	1.4	8.3	33.3	55.6	72
Black.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	8
White.....	1.8	1.8	12.7	35.5	48.2	110
Other.....	0.0	14.3	0.0	42.9	42.9	7
Catholic.....	0.0	0.0	2.9	45.7	51.4	35
Protestant....	0.0	3.2	14.3	31.7	50.8	63
Jewish.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	3
Agnostic/Other	0.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	40.0	5
None/No Answer	5.3	5.3	5.3	36.8	47.4	19
Under 20.....	1.4	4.3	13.0	36.2	44.9	69
21-25.....	3.3	0.0	3.3	43.3	50.0	30
26-30.....	0.0	0.0	15.4	23.1	61.5	13
31-35.....	0.0	0.0	25.0	37.5	37.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	3
Democrat.....	0.0	0.0	5.7	40.0	54.3	35
Republican....	2.5	2.5	15.0	35.0	45.0	40
Independent...	0.0	3.2	9.7	35.5	51.6	31
Other/None/ Don't Know..	0.0	5.9	17.6	29.4	47.1	17
No Answer.....	50.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	2

Note--Variables Q20 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Student respondents strongly disagreed with government abolishing income tax deductions for children born in the future. Over 84 percent of all respondents showed strong disagreement with the statement. Blacks, Catholics, and Democrats tended to disagree with the statement more strongly (over 90 percent). Disagreement with the statement was strong regardless of sex, race, religion, age, or political affiliation.

Table 13

Our population growth someday
must stop. (Q13)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	12.0	21.6	16.8	25.6	24.0	125
Male.....	18.9	26.4	15.1	18.9	20.8	53
Female.....	6.9	18.1	18.1	30.6	26.4	72
Black.....	0.0	0.0	25.0	0.0	75.0	8
White.....	13.6	24.5	15.5	25.5	20.9	110
Other.....	0.0	0.0	28.6	57.1	14.3	7
Catholic.....	8.6	11.4	22.9	31.4	25.7	35
Protestant....	12.7	23.8	14.3	23.8	25.4	63
Jewish.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	66.7	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	10.5	36.8	15.8	26.3	10.5	19
Under 20.....	8.7	20.3	17.4	24.6	29.0	69
21-25.....	20.0	26.7	13.3	23.3	16.7	30
26-30.....	15.4	23.1	15.4	23.1	23.1	13
31-35.....	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	12.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	50.0	0.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	33.3	0.0	0.0	66.7	0.0	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

More student respondents were inclined to disagree with the statement that our population growth someday must stop than were inclined to agree (49.6 percent vs. 33.6 percent). Blacks (75 percent), Catholics (57.1 percent), and those under 20 years of age (53.6 percent) were more disposed to disagree with the statement. No major grouping agreed with the statement.

Table 14

Unregulated human population growth is beneficial,
or good, for the United States. (Q14)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	2.4	8.8	32.8	32.0	24.0	125
Male.....	5.7	5.7	34.0	26.4	28.3	53
Female.....	0.0	11.1	31.9	36.1	20.8	72
Black.....	12.5	12.5	12.5	37.5	25.0	8
White.....	1.8	9.1	32.7	31.8	24.5	110
Other.....	0.0	0.0	57.1	28.6	14.3	7
Catholic.....	2.9	14.3	45.7	22.9	14.3	35
Protestant....	1.6	7.9	30.2	31.7	28.6	63
Jewish.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	100.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	0.0	5.3	15.8	47.4	31.6	19
Under 20.....	2.9	8.7	39.1	31.9	17.4	69
21-25.....	0.0	16.7	16.7	33.3	33.3	30
26-30.....	7.7	0.0	23.1	30.8	38.5	13
31-35.....	0.0	0.0	50.0	25.0	25.0	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	33.3	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

More than half the student respondents (56 percent) disagreed with the statement that unregulated human population growth is beneficial for the United States. Females (56.9 percent) were slightly more inclined to disagree with the statement than were their male counterparts (54.7 percent). No major grouping felt that unregulated population growth is beneficial to the United States. Disagreement with the statement was strong regardless of sex, race, religion, or age. Those in the 21-30 age category tended to strongly disagree with the statement.

Table 15

Assuming that a population problem exists, population stability can be achieved by voluntary means in our democracy by informing/educating people of the causes and consequences of population growth. (Q15)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	32.0	50.4	7.2	6.4	4.0	125
Male.....	32.1	47.2	5.7	11.3	3.8	53
Female.....	31.9	52.8	8.3	2.8	4.2	72
Black.....	37.5	37.5	12.5	0.0	12.5	8
White.....	33.6	48.2	7.3	7.3	3.6	110
Other.....	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	7
Catholic.....	25.7	62.9	5.7	2.9	2.9	35
Protestant....	34.9	46.0	6.3	6.3	6.3	63
Jewish.....	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	40.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	5
None/No Answer	36.8	42.1	10.5	10.5	0.0	19
Under 20.....	26.1	55.1	7.2	8.7	2.9	69
21-25.....	40.0	43.3	10.0	3.3	3.3	30
26-30.....	30.8	61.5	7.7	0.0	0.0	13
31-35.....	25.0	50.0	0.0	12.5	12.5	8
36-40.....	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	66.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Over two-thirds of the student respondents (82.4 percent) agreed with the statement that population stability can be achieved by voluntary means by educating people of the causes and consequences of population growth. All major groupings were strongly supportive of the statement. Females (84.7 percent), whites (81.8 percent), Catholics (88.6 percent), and those in the 26-30 age group were more strongly inclined to agree with the statement.

Table 16

People should limit the size of their family even though they can afford to properly support a larger number of children. (Q16)

Respondents	Percent					Number
	Completely Agree	Generally Agree	Not Sure; Undecided	Generally Disagree	Completely Disagree	
All.....	20.0	32.8	16.8	14.4	16.0	125
Male.....	20.8	32.1	17.0	11.3	18.9	53
Female.....	19.4	33.3	16.7	16.7	13.9	72
Black.....	12.5	37.5	25.0	0.0	25.0	8
White.....	20.9	31.8	16.4	14.5	16.4	110
Other.....	14.3	42.9	14.3	28.6	0.0	7
Catholic.....	5.7	22.9	22.9	25.7	22.9	35
Protestant....	25.4	38.1	15.9	7.9	12.7	63
Jewish.....	66.7	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other	20.0	40.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	5
None/No Answer	21.1	36.8	10.5	15.8	15.8	19
Under 20.....	14.5	30.4	23.2	17.4	14.5	69
21-25.....	26.7	26.7	13.3	13.3	20.0	30
26-30.....	23.1	46.2	7.7	0.0	23.1	13
31-35.....	12.5	50.0	0.0	25.0	12.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Over half of the student respondents (52.8 percent) agreed with the statement that people should limit their family size even though they can afford to properly support a larger number of children. Agreement with the statement was more likely among non-Catholics. Religion was an important variable. Only 28.6 percent of the Catholics agreed with the statement. Age also appeared to be an important variable. Agreement with the statement became progressively stronger with age categories.

Table 17

The present population of the United States is now about 233 million people. In your opinion, what would be the IDEAL number of people for this country? (Q17)

Respondents	(In millions)							Percent	Number
	Less Than 150	150 to 199	200 to 249	250 to 299	300 to 349	350 to 399	More Than 400	Don't Know or No Answer	
All.....	4.0	10.4	23.2	15.2	14.4	2.4	9.6	20.8	125
Male.....	5.7	11.3	24.5	17.0	13.2	5.7	11.3	11.3	53
Female.....	2.8	9.7	22.2	13.9	15.3	0.0	8.3	27.8	72
Black.....	0.0	37.5	0.0	12.5	12.5	0.0	25.0	12.5	8
White.....	4.5	9.1	24.5	16.4	14.5	2.7	8.2	20.0	110
Other.....	0.0	0.0	28.6	0.0	14.3	0.0	14.3	42.9	7
Catholic.....	2.9	11.4	20.0	11.4	8.6	0.0	22.9	22.9	35
Protestant....	4.8	9.5	23.8	17.5	20.6	1.6	4.8	17.5	63
Jewish.....	0.0	33.3	0.0	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	3
Agnostic/Other	0.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	20.0	20.0	0.0	40.0	5
None/No Answer	5.3	10.5	31.6	15.8	5.3	5.3	5.3	21.1	19
Under 20.....	4.3	13.0	24.6	15.9	18.8	1.4	8.7	13.0	69
21-25.....	3.3	13.3	20.0	16.7	13.3	0.0	6.7	26.7	30
26-30.....	7.7	0.0	38.5	7.7	7.7	0.0	7.7	30.8	13
31-35.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	12.5	0.0	25.0	25.0	37.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	33.3	33.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	33.3	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

The most frequent choice by student respondents tended to cluster around the 200-249 million population grouping (23.2 percent). Altogether, 41.6 percent of the student respondents were inclined to believe the ideal population size for the United States should continue to increase beyond the present size of 233 million people while only 14.4 percent felt that the ideal population size should be less than 200 million people. Males, whites, those professing no religious affiliation, and those in the 26-30 age category, were more inclined to believe the ideal number of people for this country should be 200-249 million--slightly more or less than the present population.

Table 18

In addition to both parents, what do you think is the
IDEAL number of natural children that
a family should have? (Q18)

Respondents	Number of Children						Number
	None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five or More	
All.....	2.4	0.0	64.0	28.0	3.2	2.4	125
Male.....	3.8	0.0	62.3	26.4	3.8	3.8	53
Female.....	1.4	0.0	65.3	29.2	2.8	1.4	72
Black.....	0.0	0.0	25.0	75.0	0.0	0.0	8
White.....	2.7	0.0	68.2	25.5	0.9	2.7	110
Other.....	0.0	0.0	42.9	14.3	42.9	0.0	7
Catholic.....	0.0	0.0	48.6	37.1	5.7	8.7	35
Protestant.....	3.2	0.0	63.3	28.6	0.0	0.0	63
Jewish.....	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	3
Agnostic/Other.	20.0	0.0	60.0	0.0	20.0	0.0	5
None/No Answer.	0.0	0.0	78.9	15.8	5.3	0.0	19
Under 20.....	1.4	0.0	63.8	29.0	2.9	2.8	69
21-25.....	0.0	0.0	60.0	36.7	3.3	0.0	30
26-30.....	15.4	0.0	61.5	15.4	7.7	0.0	13
31-35.....	0.0	0.0	87.5	0.0	0.0	12.5	8
36-40.....	0.0	0.0	50.0	50.0	0.0	0.0	2
Over 40.....	0.0	0.0	66.7	33.3	0.0	0.0	3

Note--Variables Q21 through Q24 were cross-tabulated.

Over half the student respondents (64 percent) thought two children to be the ideal number. Opinions about the two-child family were strongest among females (65.3 percent), whites (68.2 percent), those professing no religious affiliation (78.9 percent), and members of the 31-35 age category (87.5 percent). Seventy-five percent of black respondents were more inclined to think that three children would be ideal. Of all 125 respondents, not one thought that a one-child family to be the ideal.

Table 19

Percent and number distribution of all student respondents by political philosophy and views on public issues. (Q19)

	Total Sample Percent	Total Sample Number
Extremely Liberal	3.2	4
Liberal	27.2	34
Slightly Liberal	19.2	24
Moderate/Middle of the Road	26.4	33
Slightly Conservative	8.0	10
Conservative	12.8	16
Extremely Conservative	1.6	2
Don't Know/No Answer	1.6	2
	100.0%	125

Note--This variable was cross-tabulated with Q1 through Q18.

In the entire sample, most student respondents classified themselves as being liberal. Although this independent variable was cross-tabulated with dependent variables Q1 through Q18, responses to survey items showed variations in political philosophy, but the variations were not considered to be important factors.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

Conclusions

The results of this study have shown that there is substantial disunity among student respondents relevant to the role of government in controlling population growth in this country. Race, religion, and age were the most important variables influencing variations in response to the survey items. In spite of differences along these lines, there appears to be a cautious reluctance to permit government intervention into matters of procreation. The findings imply the desire for personal autonomy and individual freedom of choice in these matters.

The results of the study tend to indicate that strong support exists favoring individual responsibility and initiative, primarily through voluntary means, to achieve population stability.

There is substantial evidence, resulting from this study, which leads to the conclusion that specific policy measures employing the use of economic incentives/deterrents, such as tax laws, to influence or control population growth, will not be acceptable to a sizeable proportion of college

students. There is strong opposition to the modification of current tax laws and policies. Present tax policy tends to benefit those with larger families by compensating the parents to assist with the additional economic burden which accompanies the raising of several children.

Although this study was not intended to exactly replicate prior research by Barnett (1971, pp. 759-765) and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972, pp. 475-509), this study did reveal similar data to support the findings of these past studies relevant to the 2-child family as the ideal. Data from this study is also supportive of the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972, pp. 475-509) findings that our population growth is a serious problem and that another 100 million people added to our population would be too much.

This study also revealed some data not supportive of portions of the above two studies. Perhaps the most interesting and important finding of this study is that which relates to the ideal population size of our country. When the two previous studies were undertaken by Barnett (1971) and the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972), the population of the United States was about 205 million people. Our current population is about 233 million. The respondents to Barnett's (1971) survey of Zero Population Growth members resulted in the

finding that 55 percent of the sample considered 150 million to be the ideal population size. One hundred fifty million people was the U.S. population around 1950. Twelve percent of the sample thought the country had not yet achieved its optimum population size and should continue to grow in numbers of people. Only three percent felt the U.S. should have more than 300 million people. By contrast, the Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972) found that 57 percent of their sample felt the present population (1970) of about 205 million was about right, 22 percent thought our population size should be smaller, and 8 percent felt an increase in population beyond 205 million would be alright.

The findings of this study provide ample evidence that a substantial proportion of the sample believe in further population growth. Over 41 percent felt the ideal/optimum population size has not yet been reached and that population should increase beyond the present size. Only 14.4 percent felt that the ideal population size should be less than 200 million people. It appears to be reasonable to conclude that respondents to this survey are more optimistic than their counterparts in the prior studies toward the potential for growth in the United States. However, this conclusion would appear to contradict the earlier noted finding that population growth is a serious

problem and adding another 100 million people to our present population is not desirable. This apparent dichotomy presents difficulty and doubt that a reasonable certitude can be reached without further research to address and explain this contradiction.

Another important finding of this study pointed out some differences with the two previous studies in regard to population control policies which would employ tax laws to control population growth. Barnett (1971) reported in his findings that a considerable amount of support for using the tax laws to control population existed within his sample population. The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972) instead found little support for using the tax laws to discourage procreation. A substantial percentage of the Commission's sample felt that the tax laws should be neutral and not encourage or discourage couples to have children. This survey found little support for the employment of tax policies to control population growth and is thus more in accord with the Commission's findings.

The Commission on Population Growth and the American Future (1972) survey provided evidence sufficient enough to indicate support for a national population stabilization program. The results of this survey indicate the opposite conclusion. The major conclusion of this survey must then

be that, within this sample, there is a perceived population problem and that private and voluntary means are preferred over that of government intervention and the implementation of economic incentives/deterrents to achieve population stabilization.

Recommendations

Based upon the review of the literature and the findings and subsequent conclusions of this research, these recommendations appear to be in order:

1. This study should be replicated and extended to be representative of the population of the United States.
2. An improved survey instrument should be constructed in order to explicate the noted inconsistencies and apparent dichotomies found in portions of the original findings.
3. Development of an improved survey instrument should include items/variables designed to solicit meaningful information regarding the role of government in relation to family planning programs and in the development of a population education curriculum designed to inform and educate citizens of the causes and consequences of population growth.
4. The results of this, and subsequent research of similar intent, should be forwarded to the cognizant Congressional committee/subcommittee on population matters.

5. Earlier survey respondents (Barnett, 1971; Commission on Population Growth and the American Future, 1972) clearly indicated a preference for smaller or current population size as optimum/ideal.

This survey resulted in a similar clustering of preference for current population size as being ideal. As an extension of this research, the bases upon which respondents in this and the other earlier noted surveys tend to cluster their preferences for the population at that particular point in time as being the optimum/ideal should be determined and explicated. Since these earlier surveys were conducted, our population has grown by almost 30 million more persons in less than 13 years. This growth is in spite of a preference not to grow in population size. Concomitantly, in addition to this clustering, this survey yielded evidence of substantial support for additional growth to achieve the optimum/ideal population size. This is contrary to earlier findings. An extension of this research in order to explicate this phenomena is highly recommended.

Implications

The findings and subsequent conclusions of this survey yield at least two noteworthy observations. There are implications for policy makers and for educators.

The stated objective of H.R. 907 to have a national

population policy and achieve population stability suggests a much stronger role for government than respondents to this survey are inclined to want. Population stability implies a numerical goal. This raises many questions. Who is going to set the goal? What means are to be employed to achieve this goal? What are the penalties to the nation and to the individual if this numerical goal is not met? The potential social transformation from growth to no growth will certainly meet resistance from many interests. The form of this resistance is subject to conjecture. Any public policy which impinges upon the behavior of the individual in an overt, or direct manner to control population growth must be constructed with the utmost care, caution, and concern. Development and implementation of a population policy, if necessary, would be best accomplished within the framework of a democracy. Constitutional safeguards should help to ensure the best possible policy development consistent with societal and individual welfare and interest. An educated citizenry is vital to this policy development if voluntary individual means to control population growth are to have any reasonable chance for success.

The implications for educators? Certainly the development and implementation of a population education curriculum in the schools to inform and educate our

citizens of the causes and consequences of population growth must receive support. Although the content of such a program may be controversial, the findings of this study tend to indicate a measure of support does in fact exist for population education. As a minimum, a population education program should include information of the subjects of population policies, economic, societal, and environmental impact, population theory, and quality of life aspects of population growth. The appropriate approach, i.e., prescriptive or non-prescriptive, must be predicated upon the specific situation and public attitudes at the time. The development and implementation of a population education curriculum, within the framework of our democracy, has national implications. Therefore, such development should be centralized. This suggests a role for government, and perhaps a more acceptable approach, for the control of population growth in the United States.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ary, D., Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. Introduction to research in education. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- Barnett, L. D. Zero Population Growth, Inc. BioScience, 1971, 21, 759-765.
- Benshoof, J. Reproductive freedom. In Lobbying for freedom in the 1980s, pp. 71-111. Edited by Kenneth P. Norwick. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1983.
- Bowie, N. E., & Simon, R. L. The individual and the political order: An introduction to social and political philosophy. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Brown, L. R., McGrath, P. L., & Stokes, B. Twenty-two dimensions of the population problem. Population Reports, November 1976, Series J, J-177-J-204.
- Burns, J. M., & Peltason, J. W. Government by the people: The dynamics of American national, state, and local government. 6th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1966.
- Day, L. H., & Day, A. T. Too many Americans. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1964.
- Dye, T. R. Understanding public policy. 4th ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1981.
- Harvard Law Review. Legal analysis and population control: The problem of coercion. Harvard Law Review, 1971, 84, 1856-1911.
- Johnson, S. A. Essentials of political science. Rev. Woodbury, New York: Barron's Educational Series, Inc., 1971.
- Matras, J. Introduction to population: A sociological approach. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Malthus, T. R. An essay on the principle of population (1798). In An essay on the principle of population: Text, sources and background criticism, pp. 15-130. Edited by Philip Appleman. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1976.

- _____. An essay on the principle of population: From the revised edition (1803-). In An essay on the principle of population: Text, sources, and background criticism, pp. 130-139. Edited by Philip Appleman. New York: W. W. Norton & Co., 1976.
- Haupt, A., & Kane, T. T. Population handbook. Washington, DC: Population Reference Bureau, 1978.
- McNall, S. G. Social problems today. Boston: Little Brown and Co., 1975.
- Ophuls, W. Ecology and the politics of scarcity: Prologue to a political theory of the steady state. San Francisco: W. H. Freeman, 1977.
- Population Reference Bureau. U.S. Population: Where we are; where we're going. Population Bulletin, June 1982, 37, 1-51.
- Spengler, J. J. Population problem: In search of a solution. Science, 1969, 166, 1234-1238.
- U.S. Department of Commerce. Bureau of the Census. Statistical abstract of the United States: 1982-83, 103d ed. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1982.
- U.S. Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. Aspects of population growth policy, Vol. VI. Edited by Robert Parke, Jr. and Charles F. Westoff. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1972.
- U.S. Council on Environmental Quality and Department of State. The global 2000 report to the President: Entering the 21st century, Volume I: The Summary Report. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office, 1980.
- U.S. Congress. House. A bill to establish a national population policy and to establish an office of population policy. H.R. 907, 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981.
- U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. National population policy. Hearings before a subcommittee on Census and Population of the committee on Post Office and Civil Service on H.R. 907, 97th Cong., 2nd sess., 1982.

U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. Global 2000 Report. Hearings before a sub-committee on Census and Population of the committee on Post Office and Civil Service on the Global 2000 Report and H.R. 907, 97th Cong., 1st sess., 1981.

Wells, D. Resurrecting the dismal parson: Malthus, ecology, and political thought. Political Studies, 1982, 30, 1-15.

Wright, B., & Weiss, J. P. Social Problems. Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1980.

APPENDIX A
SURVEY INSTRUMENT

ROLE OF GOVERNMENT IN CONTROLLING HUMAN POPULATION GROWTH SURVEY

Attitude Questionnaire

The information you provide will help me to get an insight about your attitude and beliefs regarding the role of government in controlling human population growth in the United States. Permission has been granted by cognizant University of Central Florida educators to conduct this survey. The information you provide will be held in strict confidence and all data will be handled on a statistical basis only.

Please indicate your opinion by placing a number in the space before each statement (1 thru 16):

- 1--Completely agree
- 2--Generally agree
- 3--Not sure; undecided
- 4--Generally disagree
- 5--Completely disagree

- ___ 1. Human population growth in the United States is a serious problem.
- ___ 2. The government should try to do something to slow down population growth in the United States.
- ___ 3. Our natural resources are being used up too fast because of human population growth.
- ___ 4. Another 100 million people added to our present population would be alright.
- ___ 5. The United States should develop a comprehensive and coordinated national population policy with a goal of eventual population stabilization.
- ___ 6. The United States government should not be involved in matters of human population size and growth, should remain neutral, and let our population freely attain its own level.
- ___ 7. Population control and stability is not a proper political or governmental activity, function, or obligation.
- ___ 8. In order to halt, or slow down, our population growth and size, the government should use economic deterrents, such as limiting/reducing public-financed medical care, housing, welfare payments, loans, and other subsidies to families after the first 2 children.
- ___ 9. The government should limit by law the number of children a person can have in order to slow down, or halt, our population growth.
- ___ 10. An economic incentive, such as an annual cash payment, should be given to those who limit the number of children necessary to halt our population growth.

(2)

- ___ 11. Government should tax those who have more children than necessary to halt our population growth.
- ___ 12. Government should abolish all income tax deductions for children who are born in the future.
- ___ 13. Our population growth someday must stop.
- ___ 14. Unregulated human population growth is beneficial, or good, for the United States.
- ___ 15. Assuming that a population problem exists, population stability can be achieved by voluntary means in our democracy by informing/educating people of the causes and consequences of population growth.
- ___ 16. People should limit the size of their family even though they can afford to properly support a larger number of children.
17. The present population of the United States is now about 233 million people. In your opinion, what would be the IDEAL number of people for this country?
 _____ (Please indicate in thousands, millions, etc.)

18. In addition to both parents, what do you think is the IDEAL number of natural children that a family should have? Check (X) one:
 0 children ___ 1 child ___ 2 children ___
 3 children ___ 4 or more children (specify number) ___

19. Generally, your political philosophy and views on public issues is best described as being (check one):
 extremely liberal ___ liberal ___ slightly liberal ___
 moderate, middle of the road ___ slightly conservative ___
 conservative ___ extremely conservative ___

20. Generally, your political affiliation is best described as being (check one):
 Democrat ___ Republican ___ Independent ___
 Other (please specify) ___ Don't know ___

21. What is your religion, if any? _____

22. Your age: _____

23. Your sex: _____

24. Your race: _____

Thank you for taking the time to complete this survey questionnaire. Comments and questions regarding this survey may be directed to:

Mr. Thomas E. Yost
 Educational Foundations Department
 College of Education
 University of Central Florida
 Orlando, Florida 32792

73 / 74